

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

May 14, 2002

6:30 PM

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order advising that the Committee shall first address regular business followed by discussion and actions relating to the FY2003 CIP budget.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Wihby, Shea, Smith, Lopez

Messrs: R. Ludwig, L. Berard, R. MacKenzie, R. Johnson, Chief Kane,
S. Maranto

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Presentation by Ron Ludwig, Director of PR&C and the present lease holder of the Derryfield Restaurant regarding the possibility of constructing a new clubhouse at the golf course.

Mr. Ludwig stated I have with me here this evening Mr. Lee Berard from Berard and Martel Architectural Firm. I also have the current leaseholders of the Derryfield Country Club, Mike Lanois and Bill LaBerge. We will try to move this along as quickly as possible. What I have furnished you with in a small package that you can review at a later date are just some items that are supporting our proposal this evening related to the Derryfield Country Club. As you know, the building was built in the late 1800's. Many of you have probably visited it in various states of construction or redevelopment. At the present time it is...not to shoot ourselves in the foot here, it is in fairly decent shape but it does suffer from a lot of deficiencies that are being brought forward and we will bring those forward shortly. In 1998 we did a master plan with a golf course architect that set a course for us as it relates to how we would make improvements on the golf course and also how we would make improvements to the existing clubhouse and parking lot going forward down the road. That report is listed in your packet as Item 1 from Orcutt Associates and that was done in 1998. Basically it spells out the deficiencies of the building and how we could correct them with some costs associated with those types of renovations. It also spells out...at the rear of their report it kind of compares it to what the cost of a new facility may look like in terms of new construction back in 1998. I just want to reinforce that it is five years old. There are several issues with the existing building. I would just like to

identify a few. The life and safety and the fact that we do not have fire suppression. We do not have proper ADA requirements at this point although we have addressed some to be able to get people into the locker rooms and into the restaurant. We have made those kinds of improvements. Effectively we have outgrown the building. The City exists on the lower level and in conjunction our park offices are there with the restaurant. We exist in kind of the rear. The upstairs is pretty much inaccessible as it relates to the small banquet hall. We can get about 80 people in there on a good day and it is pretty much inaccessible at this point. The cost associated with trying to make it accessible are pretty much out of reach and cost prohibitive. We did a corresponding study with an architect on our own behalf, Kurt Lauer, to kind of compare some of the square footage numbers. Now in the Lauer Report what you will notice is that his prices of new construction and options are considerably more. We kind of asked our person to do an out front study and we never got back to him with a proposal that said okay the wish list is over and at this point we are going to look at the real nuts and bolts of what we can do and what the square footage is. His report speaks to a larger square foot building so you will see that some of the costs are off in Kurt's report. We also asked Mr. Lauer to put together a small report on any historical significance that the building may have. We felt that the building was around for a long time and he looked into that with the State and in his opinion right now there is really no historical significance to the building. At the request of the Mayor several months ago we asked the Fire Department to come over and do an inspection and they have always been good and worked with us. I enclosed a copy of their report. It by no means closes us down but it does speak to some real serious issues that the building has. We are pretty much maxed out electrically. We can't put one more outlet in the building without changing the whole service entrance and it has pretty much become an issue. Item 4 is Mr. Berard's report, which pretty much speaks to the nuts and bolts of the project and how we feel it would move forward. Effectively it doesn't speak to the fact that we would move our maintenance facility which presently exists to the rear of the country club over to the 18th hole in the wooded area that would be far more user friendly to our maintenance people that gets piles of loom and dirt and things like that where we work out of the golfer's way and out of that area and moves it over to an area where we could be far more comfortable. The last portion is a one-page sheet that I will go over after Lee makes a little presentation here that kind of ties in what we feel the financial arrangements could look like. We have by no means negotiated any final contracts here or even attempted to do so. In the opinion of the Solicitor, if we were to move forward with our negotiations we would be tearing up the existing contract that we presently have and pretty much starting brand new. Aside from that...basically there are three players here. There is the current lease who has an interest in moving forward with helping us pay the debt service on a new building. There is the Enterprise, which we feel we could support a portion of within the confines of our budget moving forward without funding the project

on the back of the golfer or the skater or the skier or anybody else entirely. We really know that we couldn't do that. The third player is why we are here this evening because basically we would be asking for about \$600,000 in CIP funds on the City side in general obligation bonds. That is basically what we have come to an agreement on. With that being said, I would be happy to go back to this sheet at the end of the presentation. I would like to ask if it is okay if Lee Berard could give us a run down on the square footage of the building, what it could look like, and where it would be situated on the site.

Chairman O'Neil stated I know there have been discussions over what is going to be in the building. There was talk that maybe P&R offices wouldn't be in a new building but could be relocated to another place. There was talk about whether or not it has a banquet hall. There was even talk of just building a plain old clubhouse and very limited restaurant. What is being presented tonight?

Mr. Ludwig replied basically we are pretty much emulating what we have in place now. It is a restaurant/lounge with a banquet facility. The Parks offices...give the lay of the land at the particular site it lends itself to kind of a walkout basement effect on the lower level where the Parks offices could exist to best utilize the space in our opinion. At the lower level as well and I will let Lee speak to this but we would also be creating an area for just simple men's rooms and a clean-up area. If you didn't want to go in the restaurant/lounge you could get done playing golf, go in and wash up and clean and go to the trunk of your car and go home if that was your choice. You wouldn't even have to go up into the restaurant. Also on the lower level would be a small pro shop somewhere in the vicinity I think of 2,000 square feet or in that area and again these numbers are not all defined, where we could conduct our business for greens fees and you would have a small section to sell clubs and things as he does now, but basically to conduct City business. The conceptual is pretty impressive when you look at the façade of the building and you stand with your back to the East. You can see that it really lends itself to a beautiful building in an area...we do have a gem here if the City saw fit to move forward with this project. Basically it is on the table. I think this Committee could go back...the City could come back and say we want to build something less than what we are going to show you tonight and that is fine. We understand that.

Mr. Lee Berard showed the conceptual drawing. He stated this would be the front of the proposed facility where the existing field maintenance facility is. This would take its place and the parking lots would be all in front of this building as it is shown right here – all on grade entrances on this side. Ten thousand square feet foot print. Two stories making a total of 20,000 square feet. That would be the backside facing out to the golf course. The Parks & Recreation office would be over here. The pro shop would be again on the lower level over here. The kitchens and the services would be in the middle. The function hall would be on

this side and the restaurant would be on this side. Mixed in there are men's and women's bathrooms, locker rooms, cart storage and all of the ancillary parts of the project. This is the floor plan. It is certainly a little small from your view over there but again the pro shop is approximately 2,600 or 2,700 square feet. Storage for Parks and Recreation would be 3,200 square feet. On the upper level, you have the restaurant here at 3,400 feet with a large deck. The kitchen is in the middle. Then of course the function room is over here.

Chairman O'Neil stated before we go any further would it be possible to duplicate these at some point and put it as a handout for the Aldermen so they don't get all hung up tonight on specific details.

Mr. Berard replied yes I can do that. We are in the business of doing a lot of clubhouses and pro shops for golf courses and this is actually a pretty standard approach to doing these things. It is not anything over the top that a good standard civic facility might be built.

Alderman Wihby asked is that a deck for outside partying.

Mr. Berard answered yes that would come off the restaurant as does the deck at the Derryfield right now.

Mr. Ludwig stated to address that we have done changes before and built it into their contract. They have been good to work with.

Chairman O'Neil asked am I correct to say that the existing contract has probably been amended half a dozen to a dozen times.

Mr. Ludwig answered basically the City was always pretty much in the position to ask for the tenant to come in and make the improvements, therefore, rents were adjusted accordingly in that regard and that is certainly the case in the facility that they are in. Any fix up that has been done to the existing building has been done by these gentlemen at this time.

Alderman Lopez asked has the Finance Director been involved in the financial aspects here and how does that calculate in the existing lease going into something like this. Did all of the numbers work out to what you have presented here tonight?

Mr. Ludwig answered yes. To answer your question we were in direct contact with Randy Sherman and Kevin Clougherty as it relates to the negotiation process. We had meetings with the Mayor as well on one occasion and on several occasions we involved the Finance Department to make sure that we were using

the proper percentage as it relates to bond expense and what the current rates were. Now we worked from the best numbers that Finance provided us at that point with the understanding that they can fluctuate a little bit.

Alderman Lopez asked but at some point you will probably go back to them and get some verification that Finance agrees with all of the numbers.

Mr. Ludwig replied the answer to that question is quite simply yes. We are not in the negotiation process. We were just trying to get to a point between the three parties where we could come with a number that we were close to here as the Berard report indicates we also asked an individual to come in from the outside and give us some best construction estimates to make sure that we were close to the numbers that we want to be in. If this project doesn't fly at that number, it isn't going to fly.

Alderman Lopez stated along that same line, something stuck in my mind. You said \$600,000 from the City side. Why wouldn't you Enterprise this whole project?

Mr. Ludwig replied well we looked at that and basically as that one page sheet we provided says we kind of worked backwards. Initially we went back and forth with the lease to determine what portion of the building he was really going to be the major user of and we came up with a number of 2/3 of the building that would be assignable to him. Then we went backwards and said the Enterprise has costs related to construction of moving the new maintenance facility and it also has a loss of rent from the current facility of about \$24,000. We also felt that it for due diligence we would be paying for a portion of what the pro shop existed in and things like that. Those totaled I think about \$383,000 that we felt we could be responsible for. I think there is wiggle room in what the Enterprise can be responsible for as it relates to what the tax portion could fund. There is a little bit of wiggle room in there but not a lot. We want it to be as close as possible.

Alderman Lopez stated the other thing was you mentioned that you would have space underneath there right. Is that free space or would they get rent from the City?

Mr. Ludwig replied again space as it relates to what. On the lower level it would be the City, the pro shop, some storage for the restaurant, which is still kind of subject to debate and then just men's and ladies' rooms. We are not building any lockers into this anymore.

Alderman Lopez asked so would the City pay rent.

Mr. Ludwig answered no.

Alderman Lopez asked so it would be free space for the City.

Mr. Ludwig answered correct.

Alderman Wihby stated you are asking for \$600,000 yet isn't that the same thing on Item 4 that we are going to be voting on.

Mr. Ludwig replied that is different.

Alderman Shea asked when do you want the approval, for FY03 or FY04.

Mr. Ludwig answered we talked a little bit about that and we think that everything considered we feel that we could get this project going and again we may be here at some point asking for some kind of relief as it relates to the method of construction management we are going to use, whether it is the straight City procurement process or whether there is an alternative method that may be more viable for this project. That is an issue that we may be talking to this Committee or the entire Board about also. However, we would like to get the project underway maybe late summer as it relates to moving the maintenance building over to the Nyberg Lane side of the 18th hole. That opens up the existing site that we would like to use for this building. Maybe we could get this underway in late fall and work right through the winter and somewhere in April or May we would like to say we are open. That would be FY03.

Alderman Wihby stated there is an item in the CIP budget that says Parks and Recreation, Derryfield Country Club Rehabilitation, \$1.3 million. Is that what we are talking about?

Mr. Ludwig replied it gets a little confusing because there are several issues that we have requested in Enterprise and some of them have yet to be started up and some of them roll over.

Alderman Wihby asked well what action is necessary if we want to go ahead with this. What action are you looking for today? Just passing the Mayor's recommended CIP takes care of this?

Mr. Ludwig answered I think what we are talking about is \$600,000 give or take here as it relates to the City's obligation to help pay for space for the Parks & Recreation offices and a commitment to this building going forward.

Alderman Wihby asked so it is not the \$1.3 million that is on here. This is in addition? This is an addition to the CIP budget that the Mayor put forward?

Mr. Ludwig answered yes it is.

Chairman O'Neil asked if we are hopefully finalizing the CIP budget tonight in Committee anyway would we have to have that \$600,000 in here or could that be amended at some point during the fiscal year.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the Board can amend the CIP budget during the year. I guess the major question I have is would that \$600,000 count against our bond cap or not? Obviously we are extremely tight on our general obligation bonds and I can't tell you at the present time that if that is not an Enterprise supported bond amount...I can't tell you where that \$600,000 would come from.

Chairman O'Neil asked did the Finance Director give you any direction with regards to that.

Mr. Ludwig answered no.

Chairman O'Neil asked if you got a conceptual approval tonight, just conceptual...I think there are a number of issues that have to be talked about. Certainly the deck with noise, I have gotten complaints about it. Whether or not the golf pro shop pays a lease was another issue that has been brought up, etc. We could at least keep it moving without giving final approval to it. Is that okay?

Mr. Ludwig answered I think we could.

Alderman Lopez stated just to follow-up on Alderman Wihby's question about Item 4, the \$550,000 that is going to Derryfield Country Club Rehab, you seem to want this project to go forward. Is there any way to hold that up and move this project forward as priority one?

Mr. Ludwig replied I am not sure I understand the question. In other words, when you see Derryfield Country Club Rehab, not all of the numbers there are associated with the construction of this new facility. There are several issues that we will continue to work on like the irrigation system, which we did in partiality about a year and a half or two years ago. We would like to make some golf improvements to the actual physical layout of the golf course as well. Some of that is dedicated in those numbers.

Alderman Lopez asked but if you are going from \$250,000 to \$500,000 for that particular project, which I am very familiar with, at this stage is it more important

to build this project as a rehab and utilize the \$550,000 out of the Enterprise fund and move forward with this project and down the road do some of your rehab or whatever the case may be.

Mr. Ludwig responded if I am understanding your question I think we could begin to move this project forward with Enterprise dollars. I think that is true. However, we are here to say that at some point down the road the Enterprise system feels that it would need some kind of commitment on the City side to pick up approximately \$600,000.

Alderman Lopez stated just to take a look at it, if it is important to move this project, which I agree with by the way but as far as working out the details I will leave that up to the experts, that is my point. It is such an important project that is going to improve the City of Manchester and the golf area and to hold up on maybe doing something on the green or whatever you are going to do to go with this project and down the road you have an understanding, just like we do on Gill Stadium, that we have to help out and maybe next year we can give you the money. I don't know the answer to that but just to move the project that is one solution.

Chairman O'Neil replied I think the most important issue here is the current building is tired. It is going to run out of steam very shortly and it doesn't make any sense to put any more money into it. I think that is the number one issue here.

Alderman Shea stated just to carry through with what Alderman Lopez said, according to the project description here it says "improvements to the main country club building and surrounding out buildings. If cost effectiveness dictates, these may include constructing two new structures and the demolition of the existing main building." Isn't that what you are talking about?

Mr. Ludwig replied again Alderman those funds are...you are reading a narrative there that may or may not even have been written by our department. I think we have asked for but we don't always activate the kind of dollars that we activate in Enterprise. We probably have the ability to activate sufficient funds to do this whole project in Enterprise. What we are saying is we really can't afford to do the whole project in Enterprise and consequently we are here asking for some money from the City side down the road. I think that to address Alderman Lopez's question, we could keep this project moving in anticipation of securing some City funds down the road on the City side if we felt that was going to happen.

Alderman Shea stated timing is significant in terms of trying to possibly start it in FY03 and then possibly using funds in FY04 to complete it. You are saying that

you would like to complete it in April of 2003, which would not go into the funding for FY04 unless we precipitated a little bit of funding as we do now.

Alderman Gatsas stated I was going where Alderman Shea just went. To complete the project I would assume that if you are talking late May for completion and you don't complete until July then the funding on the \$600,000 side comes in or you do it with your Enterprise funds and then come back for replenishment on the City side.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Ron, if we conceptually approve moving forward but ask that we take another look at this thing maybe in June and you get a package together for all of the Aldermen and give them a chance to meet with you and the restaurant folks and Mr. Berard if necessary, can all of that happen in the next four weeks. By waiting until June would that throw the schedule off?

Mr. Ludwig replied I don't think so. Once we get going we will be up and running.

Alderman Wihby stated even if we don't fund anything in this year's budget and we recognize that you are going to use your Enterprise funds and in the next budget we could fund the money then. That is what you are looking for right? Move forward and you don't really care about funding it this year knowing that the Aldermen are making a commitment that if you finish the project we are going to replace those Enterprise funds the following year, in FY04.

Chairman O'Neil stated the only thing I want to caution you on is you have to take a look at that because if you are pulling all of your Enterprise money, that is money from McIntyre, West Side Arena, Gill Stadium, JFK...

Mr. Ludwig interjected we are really here asking...we have laid out a package and again it is subject to debate a little bit back and forth between the three entities and the three entities are the current lease, the Enterprise and the \$600,000 we are asking for from the City side. That in itself makes the project work in our opinion.

Alderman Smith asked can't we go and find out from Bob what available money there is.

Mr. MacKenzie answered at this point I have to be fairly cautious. The Board has a very ambitious program of park improvements right now. We are faced with some major costs at Livingston pool, Raco Theodore pool, Derryfield Park, Memorial field and to expect...those would compete for this \$600,000. I want to be cautious that you have some very important projects going now and I would

hate to see some of those projects not proceed next year if we simply do not have the money.

Alderman Smith asked could we get your expert advice in itemizing the bonded projects so we can see where we are and talk to Mr. Ludwig and these gentlemen. Apparently this can be done in eight months so they can wait a month or two but I don't think they can wait any longer because they would like to have the golf course open, I would assume, in May.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I can tell you at this point and again it comes down to priorities of the Board but to bond for this fiscal year which ends June 30, 2003 there is no room for \$600,000. They could not, at this point unless you wanted to defer a project like Livingston pool or Derryfield Park there are no monies up through June 30, 2003 to do this project. I hate to be the bad guy.

Alderman Shea asked do you anticipate a serious problem if they were to begin the project but the necessary \$600,000 were put on a fast track for the next bonding season. Do you see that as a problem?

Mr. MacKenzie answered I would just caution that in my estimation given the projects I see for next year, that it would be less than a 50/50 chance that the Board could come up with that amount of money. I would certainly love to see the project go back and see if it could be fully funded under the Enterprise or through revenues from the proposed restaurant. Next year at best you might have \$1.5 million to cover Parks projects and you have a Livingston pool next year that costs \$1.3 million and other pool problems like Raco Theodore that could be a significant amount of money. At this point I have to be cautious because of our limited funds.

Alderman Lopez stated basically I agree with Bob MacKenzie but I just want to clarify something and you can correct me Ron but the \$250,000 to \$550,000 for Derryfield Park won't affect McIntyre or the West Side Arena. Is that correct?

Mr. Ludwig replied no it won't.

Alderman Lopez stated so the \$550,000 that I am speaking of is for the Derryfield Park area and I agree with what Mr. MacKenzie is saying which is to work out the numbers in the Enterprise system as Plan 1 understanding that down the road we IOU some money on the City side for taking on such a project.

Chairman O'Neil replied the problem with that though is that you are going to take away projects next year that you are going to want to do. Alderman Gatsas wants to speak and then why don't we bring some...at least ask them as I suggested to

get a package together for everyone and give everyone a chance to sit down and review it and meet with the necessary parties and then we will bring it up again in June.

Alderman Gatsas asked, Bob, do any of the funds that we have in those creative pools that you have that I forget the name of but Federal funds or the Airport land sales or any of that hanging around that would qualify for this project.

Mr. MacKenzie answered let me just list four of what I would call more discretionary funds. There is Manchester Airpark money but that has to be used specifically for economic development projects.

Alderman Gatsas asked does this qualify for that.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I do not believe so. It would not qualify for HUD monies, either Community Development Block Grants or HOME funds. There is also a Downtown Business Revitalization Loan fund and I do not believe that would qualify. If I could just ask Sam to see if he is aware of any other funds. I am not sure if there are any of those discretionary funds that would cover Derryfield Country Club. Sam is telling me that there are other Federal grants but there would not be a high likelihood of those. We have been through, for example, the UPAR process, but have not been successful. We could go back and look for some grants but I don't think we could find \$600,000 quickly.

Chairman O'Neil stated we may have to play around with some options here like downsizing and cutting some stuff out, etc. I think tonight it would be important that the Committee agree that something needs to be done up there. Why don't we put this on the table and ask that Mr. Ludwig get information out to the entire Board, including the Mayor and we will bring it up again in the June meeting. I would encourage members of the Board to ask questions and meet with the restaurant people if necessary.

Mr. Ludwig asked just so I am clear you would like some of these conceptual drawings and such made available.

Chairman O'Neil answered yes.

Mr. Ludwig asked do you then want us to come back here in June.

Chairman O'Neil answered it will be a tabled item so it could come off the table theoretically. I think we need to work out the financials on this. We are going to have to take a little more in-depth look as to how we can pay for this.

Alderman Lopez asked can this Committee approve the concept of doing this so they could move forward with staff, etc.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to approve the Derryfield Country Club Clubhouse Rehabilitation project conceptually and to table this item.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Bond resolution, resolution and budget authorization for FY2002 CIP 511202 Derryfield Country Club Rehab. Phase 4 Project by increasing Bond Resolution from \$250,000 to \$500,000.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to approve resolutions and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$170,012 for 2002 CIP 210902 Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to approve the resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorizations authorizing acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$7,647.28 for 2002 CIP 412002 Manchester Police CPS Inspection Station (\$986), 2002 CIP 412202 NH Clique 2002 (5,061.28) and 2002 CIP 412302 Sobriety Checkpoint – Spring 2002 (\$1,600).

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to approve the resolution and budget authorizations.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorizations authorizing acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$8,395 for 2002 CIP 412102 Hazardous Materials Response Planning.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to approve the resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$15,000 for FY2002 CIP 810002 – Valley Cemetery Master Plan.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to approve the resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

CIP Budget Authorizations:

1994 7.40370 Sanitary Landfill Management Closure-Revision #9
2002 410702 Streetsweeper

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to approve the CIP budget authorizations.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 10 of the agenda:

Communication from Robert MacKenzie, Director of Planning, requesting support and approval of the submission of a Lead Paint Grant Application.

Alderman Shea moved to approve the request. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez asked, Mr. MacKenzie, in your letter there is that an error. Is that \$50,000 of that match requirement?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. It is a \$1 million grant and the match portion would be \$50,000. It is a relatively small match.

Alderman Lopez stated you need another zero there.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 11 of the agenda:

Communication from Bruce Thomas, Engineering Manager, seeking

approval to complete work on Francis Street and Goffstown Road as part of the City's Chronic Drain Program to be funded out of balances in the program.

On motion of Alderman Smith duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to approve this request.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 12 of the agenda:

Communication from Fire Chief Kane requesting approval to enter into a contract with Greenwood Fire Apparatus Company for the purchase of a fire truck for the Cohas Brook Fire Station in the amount of \$582,833 plus \$72,000 for equipment for the truck.

Alderman Wihby moved to approve the request. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Smith stated I noticed that in this amount it says there is a pre-payment and they would save approximately \$23,000. Is that correct, Chief?

Chief Kane replied yes. There is a section in there and a lot of people put that in their contracts. If we pre-pay for the fire truck we get that savings. The problem here is that we are actually not looking to exercise the prepayment because we are looking to pay that when the truck comes in next year.

Chairman O'Neil asked is that a pretty good price that we got on that.

Chief Kane answered yes. It is a good price. We went out to bid.

Chairman O'Neil asked did it come in a little under what we expected.

Chief Kane answered exactly.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 13 of the agenda:

Communication from Kevin Sheppard, Deputy PW Director, submitting a status report of the MER Account and requesting the following:

- a) approve Mayor's recommended FY03 MER, subject to final bond start-up;
- b) allow Highway to purchase a replacement for a 3-ton dump

- truck with \$49,000 from FY03 unassigned funds plus balance of FY02 funds totaling \$88,483.50; and
- c) utilize \$18,000 of projected FY02 cash balance to purchase a cargo van for BMD.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to approve this request.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 14 of the agenda:

Request for a sewer abatement by Kevin J. Howe, 707 Chestnut Street.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to approve the sewer abatement in the amount of \$680.45.

Chairman O'Neil advised that the Committee shall now address recommendations for changes to the FY2003 CIP budget Resolution:

“Amending a Resolution ‘Approving the Community Improvement Program for 2003, Raising and Appropriating Monies Therefore, and Authorizing Implementation of Said Program.’”

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I know there were members of the Traffic Committee that wanted to be present for this discussion. I don't know if you want to call a brief recess so that we can let them know you are about to begin. We just want to notify the Committee members that you are about to start this discussion.

Chairman O'Neil called for a brief recess.

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting back to order.

Chairman O'Neil stated hopefully the members of the Committee are in receipt of the handouts. I want to thank the Board for getting back to the Committee with regards to some of their concerns. I want to especially thank Bob MacKenzie and Sam Maranto for their hard work in trying to address all of the needs and requests of the Board of Aldermen. The only item that is fairly new and kind of came up at the last minute and actually there is two...at the bottom the \$75,000 with regard to the City Motorized Equipment Replacement. Bob do you want to bring us up-to-date or Ron Johnson on what happened with the bandstand.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I will quickly brief you and if you want to have more questions answered, Ron Johnson is here. We became aware today that the mobile bandstand, which is used constantly by the City and has probably been in use close

to 30 years is not going to pass inspection and is, therefore, going to be put out of commission. It is very heavily used by the general public and Parks & Recreation and others. We did find a way to potentially fund that under the MER program and we are hoping to resolve that problem quickly. There is some lead-time apparently in purchasing this. We will know more tomorrow.

Alderman Wihby asked are there any funds generated from letting people use this.

Mr. Johnson answered at this time the only fees that are charged are for our man that goes out with the bandstand. It does have mechanisms that our employees have to open up. That is the only fee. We might want to consider an additional fee just for the use but it averages \$25/hour for the employee to go out with the bandstand.

Alderman Wihby asked so this is nothing you could take out of the Enterprise fund and make it self-sufficient.

Mr. Johnson answered no it is not an Enterprise issue. It is really a service that we provide to the City. It goes out for parades, for non-profit groups, etc.

Alderman Wihby asked when it goes out for a parade all you do is charge for the person to open and close it.

Mr. Johnson answered that is correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated one of the last services it provided was honoring Alderman Smith in the St. Patrick's Day Parade at the end of March.

Alderman Lopez stated I have a couple of questions. I am very familiar with it. The number of times we use it a year plus the new staging that we bought now...how many panels have we bought where we could set-up two or three stages around the City?

Mr. Johnson replied the new stage is to accommodate the tent structure at Veteran's Park. We have used it for other events prior to it being erected at Veteran's Park. That was the new stage.

Alderman Lopez asked so you are using all of the panels at Veteran's Park.

Mr. Johnson answered that is correct.

Alderman Lopez asked how much are each panel.

Mr. Johnson answered it was done through the Planning Department. I think the overall price for the new stage was roughly \$70,000. I don't know the individual break out per panel. That included the ADA handicapped lift, which was required for the new stage.

Alderman Lopez stated I am just thinking out loud but have you analyzed the places where the mobile van goes and the number of people that are on it. I know that at the St. Patrick's Day parade there are a lot of people but I have noticed that it was used before the tent structure went up and you might have 10 people on it. Have you analyzed that where the investment of \$75,000...I guess the point that I am getting at is I would rather use \$75,000 and I am not saying I won't go along with this but for other important things like police vehicles or other vehicles we need in the City other than just this moving bandstand. I guess what I was getting at was if you had the extra panels, they are 4' x 10' or 6' x 10' and for example if we had the American Legion parade coming down, three or four of those panels would be sufficient to hold the people on that. I was wondering if you did any analysis on that before we just go out and buy another stage?

Mr. Johnson replied for the portable stage it does require some man-hours to get that erected. It isn't a type of structure or facility that you can just bring out. For the portable stage we used that at the Kolivas Park dedication. That took two days to erect and get set-up because at that time we couldn't use this stage. Also, the issue of accessibility to get the lift to go with that. It is more of a permanent type...once it gets installed it requires a lot of man hours and time to just get it in place. The function of the bandstand is for an event that we would have on a weekend. We bring it out on Friday and it comes back in on Monday. It is the ability to move it in and around the City. It does get used, I would estimate, probably at least 12-15 events during the course of the summer and then some events during the fall also.

Alderman Lopez asked do you already have a price for \$75,000. Is that going to be enough money to buy a mobile bandstand? Is that what we are saying?

Mr. Johnson answered the latest quote we had...depending on the size and we might have to reduce it downwards, it is in the range of \$75,000 and they do make them accessible now so we will resolve that issue.

Chairman O'Neil stated the only other things I would like to point out are on Derryfield Park. It will be a total of \$380,000 and the suggestion is that Parks & Recreation work with the Manchester Highway Department to do some of the roadway and parking lot and the belief between the two departments, as well as CIP staff is that we can stretch that money and actually complete Phase I and II. We all are in receipt of the letter from Alderman Garrity. I don't know if he

would like to speak to his letter with regards to funding for the Girls and Boys Club.

Alderman Garrity stated basically I would be happy to answer any questions. I have Gary Frost and Brian Tremblay here from the Boys Club if any of the Committee members have any questions at all. Basically what has happened is St. Edmonds and St. Jean are combining and when St. Edmonds closes they have pretty much told them that they are not going to renew the lease because they are going to use the basement to the hall for office space and such. The Boys Club hasn't had much success trying to find another location on the West Side.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated before actions are taken on this, I appreciate all of the work that Mr. MacKenzie has put into this but I just want to make sure for the record that we have a little bit more information for the Clerk's benefit. Items 1 and 2 I believe are from the Bond Tables. Am I correct? You are trying to recommend an amendment of a resolution that the Clerk has to prepare and I don't want to be taking it from the wrong table. I am presuming that Item 1 and 2 are from the Bond Tables. Both from General Obligation Bonds?

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes.

Deputy Clerk Johnson asked and Item 3 is from the Cash table.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Deputy Clerk Johnson asked is the \$75,000 for school improvements the Bond table.

Mr. MacKenzie answered correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated Items 1 and 2 are Bonds, 3 is Cash and 4 is Bonds.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I would just note for the record that we will need those project numbers given to the Clerk within the next 24 hours so we can make the report. You can take a motion on the whole.

Alderman Shea stated it says \$25,000 for the West Side Boys and Girls Club. Is that correct?

Chairman O'Neil replied that is correct.

Alderman Shea stated that is slightly different from what they asked for.

Alderman Garrity replied that was just a request.

Alderman Shea asked are you satisfied with the \$25,000.

Mr. Tremblay answered yes.

Alderman Lopez stated I just wanted to clarify...are you asking for \$35,000 for staff or are you asking for \$35,000 for staff and the busing.

Mr. Frost stated it would probably be a combination of both because we would take some of the staff that we currently have in the West Side and bring them over to our Union Street clubhouse. We would utilize part of that for transportation as well.

Alderman Lopez asked how many kids are serviced on the West Side now.

Mr. Frost answered I believe the membership was a little over 200. On an average day it is anywhere from 85-100 kids.

Alderman Lopez asked and you have your own bus now right.

Mr. Frost answered right. We have three buses that we utilize for transportation.

Alderman Lopez asked so the original \$25,000 that we were going to approve tonight, that was just for staff I presume.

Mr. Frost answered that was to cover staff and costs mainly...it would have been at the St. Jean's Clubhouse.

Alderman Gatsas stated Derryfield Park...I would like to thank the Committee for its work and I guess I am looking at the additional \$30,000 that may be available from ADA accessibility moving to the playground. Is that may or shall?

Mr. Maranto replied we have asked the Parks Department to determine what the value of the equipment is that would be utilized for accessible...we can certainly come up with a number but looking at the total value of what the playground equipment is going to be is a guesstimate right now. It may even be a little bit more.

Alderman Gatsas asked it shall be more.

Mr. Maranto answered it may be a little bit more depending on what it comes in at.

Alderman Gatsas replied I am used to may and shall. Shall means it will be and may is something that is a target in the sky.

Alderman Wihby stated may says we will take care of it, don't worry.

Alderman Gatsas replied I am looking for shall take care of us, don't worry.

Mr. MacKenzie stated maybe I can rephrase it, Alderman. There shall be money to fund the ADA accessible portions of the playground. That amount of money may be about \$30,000. We don't know until we get the bids and can determine what is eligible under HUD regulations.

Alderman Gatsas replied so it shall be \$30,000 but it could be more.

Mr. MacKenzie responded it will be \$30,000 but it may be more if the specs come in and the bids come in, we can determine the price. There shall be funds to pay for the ADA eligible portions of the project.

Chairman O'Neil stated again on Derryfield that is a Parks & Recreation project with help from the Highway Department to stretch the dollar. Is there a motion on the proposed amendments?

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to approve the amendments to the Resolution.

Chairman O'Neil asked can I request one small revision. It is all under Item 15 but if you look under City Cash there is a Summer Concert Series and several people have approached me anyway that For Manchester has been doing most of the downtown concerts, the Hanover Street stuff in the fall and the jazz concert and Oktoberfest and all of that and that they may be more appropriate to get the \$29,000 to do the concerts. It was brought to my attention.

Alderman Lopez responded no that is not true. I think we need to get some background on that because I don't think that is totally true.

Chairman O'Neil asked that For Manchester has not been doing the Hanover Street concerts.

Alderman Lopez answered that is right. For Manchester does other...For Manchester does some of the concerts but Intown for \$29,000 has a commitment for that. I think we have to go back and check that and Sam probably knows more about that right now then I do.

Mr. Maranto stated I think at this time Stephanie may have got the groups ready for the summer for the concerts.

Chairman O'Neil stated I would like to see the money go to For Manchester. I don't know what the rest of the Committee wants to do. I can't make a motion.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to mention that the For Manchester group was established to do things in the City of Manchester and at some point...you know these are people that are doing something for the community but if we have to keep funding them then people are not going to go out there and raise the money in order to do some of these things. I just don't think For Manchester is the place for it to go.

Chairman O'Neil asked what is the difference if it is For Manchester or Intown. We are funding it?

Alderman Lopez answered Intown is doing this and they are working along with For Manchester. It is all basically the same group to a degree but to take money away from one...to rob Peter to pay Paul doesn't make sense.

Chairman O'Neil stated I made a recommendation. What are the wishes of the Committee?

Alderman Shea stated I don't know anything about either matter but I am assuming that if Intown has conducted this in the past logically at least this year it probably should stay with them until maybe next year when we could get a determination as to which role For Manchester plays.

Chairman O'Neil asked is there any motion to move it.

Alderman Lopez stated I agree with Alderman Shea but may I suggest that both parties come in here before this Committee and explain. They are both doing the same thing. Intown just got commitments for Thursday nights for the park. There are extra things like the Jazz Festival and things but I think we need more explanation.

Chairman O'Neil asked can we do Intown/For Manchester. Is that okay?

Alderman Wihby moved to assign the \$29,000 City Cash for 612103 to Intown/For Manchester. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Lopez being duly recorded in opposition.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated we are not quite done. You have one more thing to do here. We need a motion to take the Rine Center project out of your bond table because you did expedite that already but it has not been taken out of the FY03.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to remove the Rine Center from the FY03 CIP budget.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated so you wanted to recommend the balance of the Resolution as it stands.

Chairman O'Neil replied that is correct. Do you need a motion on that?

Deputy Clerk Johnson responded no as long as the Committee concurs. I just want to make sure that they understand that there are no other changes being submitted. This will now go out to the Finance Committee as a report of the Committee with these recommended changes.

TABLED ITEM

16. Lowell Terrace Associates request for a mortgage/debt consolidation for property on Lowell and Chestnut Streets.

This item remained on the table.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee